

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 5, 2005. Claims 1-26 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 8, 15 and 23-25 are in independent form and have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention; it should be noted that those claims are now again in the form in which they were presented in Applicant's Amendment dated December 13, 2004 (apart from some minor formal differences), as discussed below. Claims 35 and 36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and will not be mentioned further. The specification has been amended to conform the Summary of the Invention section to the current claim language. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner objected to the Abstract as containing new matter (the registration means). Since no amendment has been made to the abstract during prosecution of this application, however, it is surmised that the objection was intended to be directed to the inclusion of references to the registration means in the Summary portion of the specification. Without conceding the propriety of the objection, Applicant has deleted that feature from the claims and from the Summary, as shown above, and thus the objection is believed to have been obviated.

Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11, 13-15, 18 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,838,319 (Guzak et al.) in view of Windows NT (WinNT, screen shots) and of U.S. Patent 6,452,692 (Yacoub). In addition, Claims 2, 9, 16 and 23-26 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from those three documents in view of U.S. Patent 5,895,474 (Maarek et al.), and Claims 3, 5, 10, 12, 17

and 19, as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of *Windows NT* and *Yacoub*, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,003,040 (Mital et al.).

After thoroughly reviewing the prior art and these rejections, Applicant finds that he cannot agree with the interpretation of the prior art on which these rejections are based, and believes that the independent claims as presented in his Amendment of December 13, 2004, are allowable over the art of record, for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is an information processing apparatus capable of communicating with a plurality of peripheral devices. The apparatus includes a storage device, detection means, display means, and control means. The storage device stores predetermined objects for the peripheral devices based on directory information. The detection means detect a specific object in the directory information read from the storage device, and the display means displays, in accordance with a tree list, the specific object detected by the detection means. The control means, based on the number of steps along a directory path leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to the information processing apparatus to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device not locally connected to the information processing apparatus, permit the display means to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific object detected by the detection means.

Among other notable features of Claim 1 is that the control means, based on the number of steps along a directory path leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to the information processing apparatus to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device not locally connected to

the information processing apparatus, permit the display means to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific object detected by the detection means.

Applicant wishes to point out that Claim 1, in referring to the display being controlled based on the number of steps along a directory path from a local object to a non-local one, relates to a method of controlling display like that of method 55 in Fig. 5.¹ In the example illustrated in that Figure, the user is at PC A, to which printer (1) is directly connected. Printers (2) and (3). The display produced according to Claim 1, shows those three printers, and not objects on the network intermediate between PC A and the printer in question. In the situation illustrated in Figure 5, the printer attached to the PCs in circle 56 is also accessible to the user of PC A. In addition, printer B cannot be used by the user of PC A without obtaining access (e.g., password) at PC C. The manner of display of these latter two printers is described in the specification, but will be omitted here, as the manner of display used for printers (1) - (3) is what is recited in Claim 1.²

Applicant believes that the Office Action fails to identify anything in *Guzak* (or elsewhere in the prior art) that would teach such a manner of display, much less any control means for effecting such display, and believes moreover that that art in fact does not teach any such feature.

Guzak relates to displaying items in a hierarchical fashion in a data processing system. The *Guzak* system provides a tree view control that may be used by application programs. The tree view control enables an application program to display a

^{1/} It is of course to be understood that the claim scope is not limited by the details of any embodiment referred to but only by the terms of the claims themselves.

^{2/} Description of this Figure appears at page 16, line 21, through page 18, line 9.

hierarchical list of items. As stated, Applicant has found nothing in *Guzak* that would teach or suggest control means for, based on the number of steps along a directory path leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to the information processing apparatus to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device not locally connected to the information processing apparatus, permitting the display means to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific object detected by the detection means, as recited in Claim 1. In fact, *Guzak* is understood to fail to address a case where a peripheral device is locally connected to an information processing apparatus and a peripheral device not locally connected to the information processing device, and therefore *Guzak* fails to teach or suggest the control means of Claim 1.

For at least the above reason, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is clearly patentable over *Guzak*. Moreover, even if each of the other references relied upon in the Office Action is assumed to show all that it is cited for, and assuming that the proposed combinations of references would be permissible, the result would still not have the feature discussed above with regard to *Guzak*, and Claim 1 is therefore deemed allowable over any permissible combination (if any) of those documents.

Independent Claims 8 and 15 are method and control program claims respectively corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Additionally, independent Claims 23-25 include features similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 23-25 are believed to be patentable for reasons substantially similar as those discussed above in connection with Claim 1.


A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 544744v1